

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MIKE KREIDLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANNY L. PIXLER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C06-0697RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION

On October 17, 2007, the Court granted in part and denied in part plaintiff's motion to compel defendants to produce various financial, corporate, and accounting documents from the corporate and the individual defendants (Dkt. #105, the "Order"). Defendant Sheri Huff now moves the Court to reconsider the portion of the Order which requires her to produce her personal financial documents, including tax returns and bank statements, from 2002 to 2005.

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule 7(h).

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 Ms. Huff argues that the Court should reconsider its prior ruling based on “her  
2 extremely tenuous relation to the claims at issue in this case and the consequent  
3 irrelevance of the requested documents, and the overly burdensome nature of the  
4 request.” Ms. Huff’s Motion at p. 2. In response to the motion to compel, Ms. Huff did  
5 not argue that her relationship to the case was tenuous. Nor did she submit the facts  
6 related to the power of attorney she gave Mr. Huff. She has not shown manifest error in  
7 the prior ruling or shown new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought  
8 to the Court’s attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

9 In addition, Ms. Huff’s connection to the relevant transactions is sufficient to  
10 warrant compelling the production of her financial records. Although she was not  
11 directly involved in the Cascade transactions or in the operations of Midwest Merger  
12 Management, LLC (“Midwest”), she had an ownership interest in Midwest. Plaintiff also  
13 alleges that Ms. Huff conspired with the other defendants to defraud and to engage in the  
14 wrongful transactions, and she accepted profits from those transactions. For these  
15 reasons, and for the reasons set forth in the Order, the Court denies the motion for  
16 reconsideration.

17  
18 DATED this 2nd day of November, 2007.

19  
20  
21 

22 Robert S. Lasnik  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25